

**REMARKS*****Summary of the Amendment***

Upon consideration of the Status of Claims, claims 1 – 43 will remain pending.

***Summary of the Official Action***

In the instant Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1 – 43 over the art of record. By the present amendment and remarks, Applicants submit that the objections and rejections have been overcome, and respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding Office Action and allowance of the present application.

***Request for Acknowledgement of Receipt and Acceptance of Replacement******Sheets***

Applicants note that seven (7) replacement sheets were submitted on September 7, 2004 for review and consideration by the Examiner. However, Applicants note that the pending Office Action fails to acknowledge receipt of these replacement sheets, and, therefore, likewise fails to indicate acceptance of the same.

Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner acknowledge receipt of the replacement sheets and confirm that these drawings are acceptable.

***Acknowledgement of Allowable Subject Matter***

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claims 12 and 28 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowed if presented in independent forms that include all of the features of their base claims and any intervening claims. However, as Applicants believe that the claims from which these claims depend are allowable, Applicants are not presenting claims 12 and 28 in independent form at this

time.

***Traversal of Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

***1. Over Fisher in view of Cabasso***

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 9, 16, 33, 34, 36, 37, and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over FISHER et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,908,500) [hereinafter "FISHER"] in view of CABASSO et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,987,163) [hereinafter "CABASSO"]. The Examiner asserts that FISHER shows the recited features except for an output voltage as low as 0.3V, but asserts it would have been obvious to use a fuel cell having an output voltage as low as 0.3V in view of the disclosure of CABASSO. Applicants traverse the Examiner's assertions.

Applicants' independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a fuel cell having a low output voltage between 0.3 and 1 V, and a conversion device coupled to said fuel cell to convert an input voltage as low as 0.3 V to a higher output voltage to operate the electronic device. Further, Applicants' independent claim 33 recites, *inter alia*, coupling a fuel cell to an electronic device, and boosting an output voltage of the fuel cell as low as 0.3V to a level required by the electronic device. Applicants submit that no proper combination of the applied documents teaches or suggests the combination of features recited in at least independent claims 1 and 33.

Applicants agree with the Examiner that FISHER fails to show an output voltage as low as 0.3V. Moreover, while CABASSO discloses a fuel cell having an open cell voltage of 1.0V and a current density of 1.2A/cm<sup>2</sup> at 0.3V, neither CABASSO nor FISHER teach or suggest a dc-dc converter device coupled to the fuel cell to convert an input voltage as low as 0.3V to a higher output voltage to operate an electronic device,

as recited in independent claim 1, or boosting an output voltage of the fuel cell *as low as 0.3V* to a level required by the electronic device, as recited in independent claim 33.

As noted above, neither applied document provides any teaching or suggestion of a dc-dc converter device to convert or boost a voltage as low as 0.3V, nor is there any disclosure of any structure or device to enable one ordinarily skilled in the art to achieve such a conversion or boost for a voltage as low as 0.3V.

Because neither document teaches or suggests at least the above-noted features of at least independent claims 1 and 33, Applicants submit no proper combination of these documents can even arguably render unpatentable the instant invention.

Applicants further note that the Examiner has not shown any operating parameters of the conversion device of FISHER, such that it cannot be determined whether the dc-dc converter device of FISHER would operate in its intended manner when coupled to the fuel cell of CABASSO, or whether a sufficient voltage could be obtained when the fuel cell of CABASSO is used with the dc-dc converter device of FISHER.

Thus, Applicants further submit that the art of record fails to provide the requisite motivation or rationale for combining FISHER and CABASSO in the manner asserted by the Examiner, such that the instant rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Further, Applicants submit that claims 2, 4, 9, 16, 34, 36, 37, and 41 are allowable at least for the reason that these claims depend from allowable base claims, and because these claims recite additional features that further defines the invention

over the art of record. Thus, Applicants submit that no proper combination of FISHER and CABASSO renders obvious the combination of features recited in at least claims 2, 4, 9, 16, 34, 36, 37, and 41.

Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 9, 16, 33, 34, 36, 37, and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and indicate that these claims are allowable.

2. Over Fisher in view of Cabasso and further in view of Woodward

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 8 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over FISHER in view of CABASSO and further in view of WOODWARD et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,563,630) [hereinafter "WOODWARD"]. The Examiner acknowledges that neither FISHER nor CASSABO teach or suggest a dump resistor coupled to the conversion device, but that it would have been obvious to do so in view of the disclosure of WOODWARD. Applicants traverse the Examiner's assertions.

In addition to the above-noted discussion of FISHER and CABASSO, Applicants note that WOODWARD fails to teach or suggest any of the subject matter noted above as deficient in the other applied documents. That is, Applicants submit that WOODWARD likewise fails to teach or suggest a conversion device coupled to said fuel cell to convert an input voltage as low as 0.3 V to a higher output voltage to operate the electronic device, as recited in claim 1, or boosting an output voltage of the fuel cell as low as 0.3V to a level required by the electronic device, as recited in claim 33.

Because none of the applied documents teach or suggest at least the above-noted features of at least independent claims 1 and 33, Applicants submit no proper

combination of these documents can even arguably render unpatentable the instant invention.

Applicants further note that, notwithstanding any particular teaching of this document, WOODWARD fails to provide the requisite motivation or rationale to render the asserted combination of FISHER and CABASSO proper under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), such that this rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Moreover, as WOODWARD is directed to a device for governing a hydroelectric generating plant, not to a control for a fuel cell, it would appear that this document is wholly unrelated to the subject matter of either FISHER or CABASSO, such that it would not have been obvious to combine these documents in the manner asserted by the Examiner.

Thus, Applicants submit that claims 8 and 40 are allowable at least for the reason that these claims depend from allowable base claims, and because these claims recite additional features that further defines the invention over the art of record. Thus, Applicants submit that no proper combination of FISHER, CABASSO, and WOODWARD renders obvious the combination of features recited in at least claims 8 and 40.

Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 8 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and indicate that these claims are allowable.

3. Over Fisher in view of Cabasso and further in view of Yoon

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 13 – 15 and 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over FISHER in view of CABASSO and further in view of

YOON et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,160,382) [hereinafter "YOON"]. The Examiner acknowledges that neither FISHER nor CASSABO teach or suggest an A/D or D/A converter, but that it would have been obvious to do so in view of the disclosure of YOON. Applicants traverse the Examiner's assertions.

In addition to the above-noted discussion of FISHER and CABASSO, Applicants note that YOON fails to teach or suggest any of the subject matter noted above as deficient in the other applied documents. That is, Applicants submit that YOON likewise fails to teach or suggest a conversion device coupled to said fuel cell to convert an input voltage as low as 0.3 V to a higher output voltage to operate the electronic device, as recited in claim 1, or boosting an output voltage of the fuel cell as low as 0.3V to a level required by the electronic device, as recited in claim 33.

Because none of the applied documents teach or suggest at least the above-noted features of at least independent claims 1 and 33, Applicants submit no proper combination of these documents can even arguably render unpatentable the instant invention.

Applicants further note that, notwithstanding any particular teaching of this document, YOON fails to provide the requisite motivation or rationale to render the asserted combination of FISHER and CABASSO proper under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), such that this rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Thus, Applicants submit that claims 13 – 15 and 42 are allowable at least for the reason that these claims depend from allowable base claims, and because these claims recite additional features that further defines the invention over the art of record. Thus, Applicants submit that no proper combination of FISHER, CABASSO, and

YOON renders obvious the combination of features recited in at least claims 13 – 15 and 42.

Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 13 – 15 and 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and indicate that these claims are allowable.

4. Over Fisher in view of Yoon

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 17, 29 – 32, and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over FISHER in view of YOON. While acknowledging FISHER fails to teach or suggest two-way communication between a control unit and the electronic device, the Examiner asserts it would have been obvious to provide such two-way communication, as taught by YOON. Applicants traverse the Examiner's assertions.

Applicants' independent claim 17 recites, *inter alia*, a control unit structured and arranged to control and regulate said fuel cell, and a communication interface structured to provide two-way communication between said control unit and the electronic device. Further, Applicants' independent claim 43 recites, *inter alia*, coupling a fuel cell to an electronic device, and controlling operation of the fuel cell via a control unit; and establishing two-way communication between the control unit and the electronic device. Applicants submit that no proper combination of the applied documents teaches or suggests the combination of features recited in at least independent claims 17 and 43.

Applicants agree with the Examiner that FISHER fails to provide any teaching or suggestion of two-way communication between the control unit and the electronic

device. However, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, Applicants submit that the arrangement of YOON, which includes a control unit having an input and output coupled to the charge storage device under examination, does not teach or suggest two-way communication between the recited control unit and electronic device, as recited in at least independent claims 17 and 33.

Because neither of the applied documents teach or suggest at least the above-noted features of the claims, it would appear that no proper combination of these documents can render unpatentable the instant invention.

Further, Applicants note that YOON merely discloses an I/O interface coupled to a charge storage device, and there appears no reasonable rationale for modifying FISHER in the manner asserted by the Examiner, or in any manner that would render the instant application unpatentable.

Thus, Applicants further submit that the art of record fails to provide the requisite motivation or rationale for combining FISHER and YOON in the manner asserted by the Examiner, such that the instant rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Further, Applicants submit that claims 29 – 32 are allowable at least for the reason that these claims depend from allowable base claims, and because these claims recite additional features that further defines the invention over the art of record.

Thus, Applicants submit that no proper combination of FISHER and CABASSO renders obvious the combination of features recited in at least claims 29 – 32.

Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 17, 29 – 32, and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and indicate that these claims are allowable.



5. Over Fisher in view of Yoon and further in view of Cabasso

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 18, 19, and 21 – 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over FISHER in view of YOON and further in view of CABASSO. While acknowledging that neither FISHER nor YOON teach or suggest an individual fuel cell or the recited low voltage, the Examiner asserts it would have been obvious to use a fuel cell having a voltage as low as 0.3V, as taught by CABASSO. Applicants traverse the Examiner's assertions.

In addition to the above-noted discussion of FISHER and YOON, Applicants note that CABASSO fails to teach or suggest any of the subject matter noted above as deficient in the other applied documents. That is, Applicants submit that CABASSO likewise fails to teach or suggest two-way communication between the recited control unit and electronic device, as recited in claim 17.

Because none of the applied documents teach or suggest at least the above-noted features of at least independent claims 17, Applicants submit no proper combination of these documents can even arguably render unpatentable the instant invention.

Moreover, while CABASSO discloses a fuel cell having an open cell voltage of 1.0V and a current density of  $1.2\text{A}/\text{cm}^2$  at 0.3V, none of the applied documents teach or suggest a dc-dc converter device coupled to the fuel cell to convert an input voltage as low as 0.3V to a higher output voltage to operate an electronic device. In any event, notwithstanding any particular teaching of this document, CABASSO fails to provide the requisite motivation or rationale to render the asserted combination of FISHER and YOON proper under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), such that this rejection is improper and should

be withdrawn.

Thus, Applicants submit that claims 18, 19, and 21 – 23 are allowable at least for the reason that these claims depend from allowable base claims, and because these claims recite additional features that further defines the invention over the art of record. Thus, Applicants submit that no proper combination of FISHER, YOON, and CABASSO renders obvious the combination of features recited in at least claims 18, 19, and 21 – 23.

Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 18, 19, and 21 – 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and indicate that these claims are allowable.

6. Over Fisher in view of Cabasso and further in view of Schmidt

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 6, 7, 38, and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over FISHER in view of CASSABO and further in view of SCHMIDT et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,858,335) [hereinafter “SCHMIDT”]. While acknowledging that neither FISHER nor CASSABO teach or suggest the recited heating device, the Examiner asserts it would have been obvious to use a heating device coupled to the backup battery and to the fuel cell, as taught by SCHMIDT. Applicants traverse the Examiner’s assertions.

In addition to the above-noted discussion of FISHER and CABASSO, Applicants note that SCHMIDT fails to teach or suggest any of the subject matter noted above as deficient in the other applied documents. That is, Applicants submit that SCHMIDT likewise fails to teach or suggest a conversion device coupled to said fuel cell to convert an input voltage as low as 0.3 V to a higher output voltage to operate the electronic

device, as recited in claim 1, or boosting an output voltage of the fuel cell as low as 0.3V to a level required by the electronic device, as recited in claim 33.

Because none of the applied documents teach or suggest at least the above-noted features of at least independent claims 1 and 33, Applicants submit no proper combination of these documents can even arguably render unpatentable the instant invention.

Applicants further note that, notwithstanding any particular teaching of this document, SCHMIDT fails to provide the requisite motivation or rationale to render the asserted combination of FISHER and CABASSO proper under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), such that this rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Thus, Applicants submit that claims 6, 7, 38, and 39 are allowable at least for the reason that these claims depend from allowable base claims, and because these claims recite additional features that further defines the invention over the art of record.

Thus, Applicants submit that no proper combination of FISHER, CABASSO, and SCHMIDT renders obvious the combination of features recited in at least claims 6, 7, 38, and 39.

Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 6, 7, 38, and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and indicate that these claims are allowable.

7. Over Fisher in view of Yoon and Cabasso and further in view of Schmidt

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 24 – 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over FISHER in view of YOON and further in view of CABASSO and further in view of SCHMIDT. While acknowledging that none of FISHER, YOON, or

CASSABO teaches or suggests a heater to heat a fuel cell, the Examiner asserts it would have been obvious to do so, as taught by SCHMIDT. Applicants traverse the Examiner's assertions.

In addition to the above-noted discussion of FISHER, YOON, and CABASSO, Applicants note that SCHMIDT fails to teach or suggest any of the subject matter noted above as deficient in the other applied documents. That is, Applicants submit that SCHMIDT likewise fails to teach or suggest two-way communication between the recited control unit and electronic device, as recited in claim 17.

Because none of the applied documents teach or suggest at least the above-noted features of at least independent claims 17, Applicants submit no proper combination of these documents can even arguably render unpatentable the instant invention.

Moreover, notwithstanding what SCHMIDT teaches, this document fails to provide the requisite motivation or rationale to render the asserted combination of FISHER, YOON, and CABASSO proper under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), such that this rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Thus, Applicants submit that claims 24 – 26 are allowable at least for the reason that these claims depend from allowable base claims, and because these claims recite additional features that further defines the invention over the art of record. Thus, Applicants submit that no proper combination of FISHER, YOON, CABASSO, and SCHMIDT renders obvious the combination of features recited in at least claims 24 – 26.

Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the

rejection of claims 24 – 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and indicate that these claims are allowable.

8. Over Fisher in view of Yoon and Cabasso and further in view of Woodward

Applicants traverse the rejection of claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over FISHER in view of YOON and further in view of CABASSO and further in view of WOODWARD. While acknowledging that none of FISHER, YOON, or CASSABO teaches or suggests a dump resistor coupled to the conversion device, the Examiner asserts it would have been obvious to do so, as taught by WOODWARD.

Applicants traverse the Examiner's assertions.

In addition to the above-noted discussion of FISHER, YOON, and CABASSO, Applicants note that WOODWARD fails to teach or suggest any of the subject matter noted above as deficient in the other applied documents. That is, Applicants submit that WOODWARD likewise fails to teach or suggest two-way communication between the recited control unit and electronic device, as recited in claim 17.

Because none of the applied documents teach or suggest at least the above-noted features of at least independent claims 17, Applicants submit no proper combination of these documents can even arguably render unpatentable the instant invention.

Moreover, as WOODWARD is directed to controlling a hydroelectric ac generator, there is no teaching or suggestion for using this device in conjunction with a fuel cell. Further, WOODWARD fails to provide the requisite motivation or rationale to render the asserted combination of FISHER, YOON, and CABASSO proper under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), such that this rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Thus, Applicants submit that claim 27 is allowable at least for the reason that it depends from allowable base claims, and because it recites additional features that further defines the invention over the art of record. Thus, Applicants submit that no proper combination of FISHER, YOON, CABASSO, and WOODWARD renders obvious the combination of features recited in at least claim 27.

Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and indicate that these claims are allowable.

9. Over Fisher in view of Cabasso and further in view of Komatsu

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 3, 5, 10, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over FISHER in view of CABASSO and further in view of KOMATSU et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,917,179) [hereinafter "KOMATSU"]. The Examiner acknowledges that neither FISHER nor CASSABO teach or suggest an up converter coupled to a DC/DC converter, but that it would have been obvious to do so in view of the disclosure of KOMATSU. Applicants traverse the Examiner's assertions.

In addition to the above-noted discussion of FISHER and CABASSO, Applicants note that KOMATSU fails to teach or suggest any of the subject matter noted above as deficient in the other applied documents. That is, Applicants submit that KOMATSU likewise fails to teach or suggest a conversion device coupled to said fuel cell to convert an input voltage as low as 0.3 V to a higher output voltage to operate the electronic device, as recited in claim 1, or boosting an output voltage of the fuel cell as low as 0.3V to a level required by the electronic device, as recited in claim 33.

Because none of the applied documents teach or suggest at least the above-

noted features of at least independent claims 1 and 33, Applicants submit no proper combination of these documents can even arguably render unpatentable the instant invention.

Moreover, as KOMATSU is directed to hybrid vehicles, Applicants submit this document is wholly unrelated to the subject matter of the other applied documents, such that it would not have been obvious to combine these documents in the manner asserted by the Examiner. Applicants further note that, notwithstanding any particular teaching of this document, KOMATSU fails to provide the requisite motivation or rationale to render the asserted combination of FISHER and CABASSO proper under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), such that this rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Thus, Applicants submit that claims 3, 5, 10, and 35 are allowable at least for the reason that these claims depend from allowable base claims, and because these claims recite additional features that further defines the invention over the art of record.

Thus, Applicants submit that no proper combination of FISHER, CABASSO, and KOMATSU renders obvious the combination of features recited in at least claims 3, 5, 10, and 35.

Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 3, 5, 10, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and indicate that these claims are allowable.

10. Over Fisher in view of Yoon and Cabasso and further in view of Komatsu

Applicants traverse the rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over FISHER in view of YOON and further in view of CABASSO and further in view of KOMATSU. While acknowledging that none of FISHER, YOON, or

CASSABO teaches or suggests an up converter, the Examiner asserts it would have been obvious to do so, as taught by KOMATSU. Applicants traverse the Examiner's assertions.

In addition to the above-noted discussion of FISHER, YOON, and CABASSO, Applicants note that KOMATSU fails to teach or suggest any of the subject matter noted above as deficient in the other applied documents. That is, Applicants submit that KOMATSU likewise fails to teach or suggest two-way communication between the recited control unit and electronic device, as recited in claim 17.

Because none of the applied documents teach or suggest at least the above-noted features of at least independent claims 17, Applicants submit no proper combination of these documents can even arguably render unpatentable the instant invention.

Moreover, as KOMATSU is directed to hybrid vehicles, Applicants submit this document is wholly unrelated to the subject matter of the other applied documents, such that it would not have been obvious to combine these documents in the manner asserted by the Examiner. Thus, Applicants submit KOMATSU fails to provide the requisite motivation or rationale to render the asserted combination of FISHER, YOON, and CABASSO proper under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), such that this rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Thus, Applicants submit that claim 20 is allowable at least for the reason that it depends from allowable base claims, and because it recites additional features that further defines the invention over the art of record. Thus, Applicants submit that no proper combination of FISHER, YOON, CABASSO, and KOMATSU renders obvious



the combination of features recited in at least claim 20.

Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and indicate that these claims are allowable.

11. Over Fisher in view of Cabasso and Komatsu and further in view of Schmidt

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over FISHER in view of CABASSO and KOMATSU and further in view of SCHMIDT. The Examiner acknowledges that neither FISHER nor CASSABO teach or suggest an up converter coupled to a DC/DC converter, but that it would have been obvious to do so in view of the disclosure of KOMATSU. Applicants traverse the Examiner's assertions.

In addition to the above-noted discussion of FISHER, CABASSO, and KOMATSU, Applicants note that SCHMIDT fails to teach or suggest any of the subject matter noted above as deficient in the other applied documents. That is, Applicants submit that SCHMIDT likewise fails to teach or suggest a conversion device coupled to said fuel cell to convert an input voltage as low as 0.3 V to a higher output voltage to operate the electronic device, as recited in claim 1.

Because none of the applied documents teach or suggest at least the above-noted features of at least independent claims 1, Applicants submit no proper combination of these documents can even arguably render unpatentable the instant invention.

Applicants further note that, notwithstanding any particular teaching of this document, SCHMIDT fails to provide the requisite motivation or rationale to render the

asserted combination of FISHER, CABASSO, and KOMATSU proper under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), such that this rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Thus, Applicants submit that claim 11 is allowable at least for the reason that it depends from allowable base claims, and because it recites additional features that further defines the invention over the art of record. Thus, Applicants submit that no proper combination of FISHER, CABASSO, KOMATSU and SCHMIDT renders obvious the combination of features recited in at least claims 11.

Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and indicate that these claims are allowable.

***Application is Allowable***

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that each and every pending claim of the present invention meets the requirements for patentability under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103, and respectfully request the Examiner to indicate allowance of each and every pending claim of the present invention.

***Authorization to Charge Deposit Account***

The undersigned authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, including any extensions of time fees required to place the application in condition for allowance by Examiner's Amendment, to Deposit Account No. 19 - 0089 in order to maintain pendency of this application.


**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that none of the references of record, either taken alone or in any proper combination thereof, anticipate or render obvious

the Applicants' invention, as recited in each of claims 1 - 43. The applied references of record have been discussed and distinguished, while significant claimed features of the present invention have been pointed out.

Accordingly, reconsideration of the outstanding Office Action and allowance of the present application and all the claims therein are respectfully requested and now believed to be appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,  
Zeev ALEXRAZ et al.

  
Neil F. Greenblum  
Reg. No. 28,394

Robert W. Mueller  
Reg. No. 35,043

May 9, 2006  
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
1950 Roland Clarke Place  
Reston, VA 20191  
(703) 716-1191